

1

this Order therefore stems from those consents and 28 U.S.C. 636(c). *See* Dkt. Nos. 11, 15 (consents) & 18 (reassignment order).

Montez has not responded to the re-urged motion. Moreover, Montez's response to the November 8 Order doesn't address the issues raised in the November 8 Order that explain why Montez's various claims are subject to dismissal. Finally, there is an indication on the docket that Montez may not have received a mailed copy of the Court's December 17, 2019, Order construing Montez's letter as a response to the November 8 Order and ordering a responsive pleading from Defendants. But because Montez did receive the November 8 Order and has not adequately responded to it, his potential failure to receive a mailed copy of the December 17 Order does not affect this ruling. Moreover, it is each party's obligation to ensure that the Court has accurate contact information for that party and that the party is aware of matters that appear on the docket.

Accordingly, for all the reasons discussed above, those discussed at length in the November 8 Order, and also because Montez's failure to adequately address the issues raised in the November 8 Order and failure to respond to the Re-Urged Motion to Dismiss constitute a failure to prosecute under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), **IT IS ORDERED** that the Re-Urged Motion to Dismiss filed by Defendants Bexar County Sheriff Javier Salazar, Captain Joel Janssen, Lieutenant Darren Williams, Sergeant Roxanne Mathai, and Deputy Officer Pedro Correa, Dkt. No. 24, is **GRANTED** and Montez's claims are **DISMISSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 31st day of March, 2020.



RICHARD B. FARRER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE